Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	**Application No.**	**Applicant(s)**	
	10/712,181	LUO ET AL.	
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	BERNARD KRASNIC	2624	

All Participants: **Status of Application:** _____

  (1) _BERNARD KRASNIC (Examiner)_.   (3) _____.

  (2) _Mr. Justin D. Petruzzelli (Reg. No. 52,118)_.   (4) _____.

Date of Interview: _4 November 2009_   **Time:** _3:40pm_

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant   ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes   ☒ No
  If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:
1 and 12

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview
  directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance
  of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview
  did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Bernard Krasnic/
Examiner, Art Unit 2624

                                 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner initiated a telephone interview with the Applicant's representative, Mr. Petruzzelli (Reg. No. 52,118), to offer an Examiner's Amendment in order to expedite prosecution. The Examiner suggested having claim 1's initial content-based image classification exclude time as a consideration in order to overcome a potential new Non-Final Office Action rejection based on the Loui Article ("Automatic image event segmentation and quality screening for albuming applications" - IEEE - July 2000). The Examiner also suggested amending claim 1 to perform the different method steps using a digital computer to avoid potential issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 in regards to In re Bilski "tied to". The Examiner also suggested amending claim 12's "a different revised image classification" to be -- a different final image classification -- to overcome the 35 U.S.C. 112 2nd paragraph rejection which was addressed by the Examiner in the Final Office Action dated 9/11/2008 in page 5. Attached to this Office Action, are proposed amendments which have been agreed upon by both the Examiner and the Applicant to put this current application into conditions for allowance. The Loui article no longer teaches this proposed set of claims because Loui teaches clustering a sequence of images into events and then subdividing them into groups of images with similar content which is different from having pre-determined classes and classifying images into such classes.